

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/Pers				
14	D/OLL				
15	D/PAO				
16	SA/IA				
17	AO/DCI				
18	C/IRD/OIS				
19	NIO				
20	VC/NIC	X			
21					
22					

SUSPENSE _____ Date _____

Remarks: To # 20, Revised speech, Please review and forward comments by COB, 20 Feb.

W/C NIC
FAIR
W/S TATE

18 Feb 85

3637

STAT



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

85-

670/1

February 15, 1985

MEMORANDUM TO: NSC - Mr. Robert Kimmitt - 8504975 ✓
CIA - Mr. Thomas B. Cormack - 8504956
DEFENSE - COL R. J. Affourtit - 8504957

SUBJECT: Draft Speech to Commonwealth Club of San Francisco

Attached is a revised draft of the speech that Secretary Shultz plans to deliver to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco on February 22.

You will note that the second half of the speech -- on U.S. responses in general and on Central America in particular -- has been revised and expanded.

Bmetwley
for Nicholas Platt
Executive Secretary

Attachment:

As stated.



L290

A revolution is sweeping the world today -- a democratic revolution.

This should not be a surprise. Yet it is noteworthy because many people in the West lost faith, for a time, in the idea of democracy. It was fashionable in some quarters to argue that democracy was culture-bound; that it was a luxury only industrial societies could afford; that other institutional structures were needed to meet the challenges of development; that to try to encourage others to adopt our system was ethnocentric and arrogant.

In fact, what began in the United States of America over two centuries ago as a bold new experiment in representative government has today captured the imagination and the passions of peoples on every continent. The Solidarity movement in Poland; resistance forces in Afghanistan, in Cambodia, in Nicaragua, in Ethiopia and Angola; dissidents in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; the peaceful forces for democracy in South Africa, Chile, the Republic of Korea, and the Philippines -- all these brave peoples have something in common: They are fighting for independence and freedom -- ideals which are at the core of democracy and which the United States has always championed.

- 2 -

The American Tradition

All Americans can be proud that the example of our Founding Fathers has helped inspire millions around the globe. Throughout our own history, we have always believed that freedom is the birthright of all men and women, and that we could not be true to ourselves or to our principles unless we stood for freedom and democracy not only for ourselves, but for others.

And so, time and again in the last 200 years, we have lent our support -- moral and otherwise -- to those around the world struggling for freedom and independence. In the nineteenth century Americans smuggled guns and powder to Simon Bolivar, the Great Liberator; we supported the Polish patriots, and others seeking freedom. We well remembered how other nations, like France, had come to our aid during our own revolution.

In the twentieth century, as our power as a nation increased, we accepted a greater role in protecting and promoting freedom and democracy around the world. Our commitment to these ideals has been strong and bipartisan in both word and deed.

- 3 -

During World War I, the Polish pianist Paderewski and the Czech statesman Masaryk raised funds in the United States; then Woodrow Wilson led the way at war's end in achieving the liberation of Poland, the creation of Czechoslovakia, and the independence of other states. At the height of World War II, Franklin Roosevelt set forth a vision of democracy for the postwar world in the Atlantic Charter and Four Freedoms. The United States actively supported the process of decolonization. Harry Truman worked hard and successfully at protecting democratic institutions in postwar Western Europe and at helping democracy take root in West Germany and Japan. At the United Nations in 1948 we supported the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- which specifically calls upon all nations to have multiple political parties, regular and genuine elections, free trade unions, and a free press. John F. Kennedy drew upon the very foundations of America with his call to "pay any price ... to assure the survival and success of liberty."

The March of Democracy

The struggle for liberty is not always successful. But those who once despaired, who saw democracy on the decline, and who argued that we must lower our expectations, were at best premature. Civilizations decline when they stop believing in themselves; ours has thrived because we have never lost our conviction that our values are worth defending.

- 4 -

When Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy, was assassinated, we were shocked and saddened. But our confidence in the resiliency of democracy was renewed as hundreds of millions of India's people went to the polls freely to elect her successor. As Rajiv Gandhi leads his nation to new greatness, he demonstrates more clearly than any words or abstract scientific models that democracy is neither outmoded nor is it the exclusive possession of a few, rich, Western nations. It has worked for decades in countries as diverse as Costa Rica and Japan.

In the Western Hemisphere, almost 90 percent of the population of Latin America and the Caribbean today live under governments that are either democratic or clearly on the road to democracy -- in contrast to only one-third in 1979. In the last five years, popularly elected leaders have replaced military rulers or dictators in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Peru, and Grenada. Brazil and Uruguay will inaugurate civilian presidents in March. After a long hemispheric twilight of dictatorship, this trend toward free elections and representative government is something to be applauded and supported.

- 5 -

These changes are driven by the determination of Latin Americans to establish and protect governments responsive to their own peoples. They are not just another swing of a pendulum. The depth of participation in increasingly open political systems reflects a long-term trend -- including the revolutions in communications and expectations, and a desire to repudiate violence and create a bulwark against dictatorships of both the left and the right.

The Challenge to the Brezhnev Doctrine

Democracy is an old idea, but today we are witnessing a new phenomenon. For many years we saw our adversaries freely backing insurgencies around the world to try to spread Communist dictatorships. The Soviet Union and its proxies, like Cuba and Vietnam, have consistently supplied money, arms, and training in efforts to destabilize or overthrow non-Communist governments. In the guise of support for the so-called "struggle of peoples for national liberation," any non-Communist country was fair game for subversion. At the same time, any victory of Communism was held to be irreversible. This was the infamous Brezhnev Doctrine, first proclaimed at the time of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Its meaning is simple and chilling: Once you're in the so-called "Socialist Camp," you're not allowed to leave. Thus the Soviets say to the rest of the world: "What's mine is mine. What's yours is up for grabs."

- 6 -

In recent years, Soviet activities and pretensions have run head-on into the democratic revolution. People are insisting on their right to independence, on their right to choose their government free of outside control. Where once the Soviets may have thought that all discontent was ripe for turning into Communist insurgencies, today we see a new and different kind of struggle: people around the world risking their lives against Communist tyrannies. We see brave men and women fighting to undo the Brezhnev Doctrine.

In December 1979, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan to preserve a Communist regime that had come to power in a coup a year and a half earlier. But their invasion met stiff resistance, and the puppet government they installed has proved incapable of commanding popular support. Today, the Soviets have expanded their occupation forces and are now trying to devastate the population and the nation they cannot subdue. They are demolishing entire Afghan villages and have driven one out of every four Afghans to flee the country. They have threatened neighboring countries like Pakistan and have been unwilling to negotiate seriously for a political solution under United Nations auspices.

In the face of this Soviet invasion, the Afghans who are fighting and dying for the liberation of their country have made a remarkable stand.

- 7 -

The extraordinary courage of these brave men and women against superior forces has given them a growing capacity to resist. The countryside is largely in the hands of the resistance, and not even in the major cities can the Soviets claim complete control. The will of the Afghan resistance has not flagged. Clearly they do not share the belief of some in the West that it is better to see one's country "quietly erased," to use the memorable phrase of the Czech writer, Milan Kundera. They have held on to their cherished hopes for national liberation in an admittedly one-sided battle.

In Cambodia, the forces open to democracy, once all but annihilated by the Khmer Rouge, now are fighting occupation and the imposition of a puppet regime by a Soviet ally, Communist Vietnam. Although Vietnam is too poor adequately to feed, house, or care for the health of its own population, the Stalinist dictators of Hanoi are bent on imperial domination of Indochina, much as many had predicted before, during, and after the Vietnam War. But, as in Afghanistan, non-Communist resistance forces are struggling for Cambodian independence, and the ultimate outcome of that struggle is far from decided.

In Africa, as well, the Brezhnev Doctrine is being challenged by the drive for independence and freedom.

- 8 -

In Ethiopia, the Soviet-backed dictatorship of President Mengistu has followed the now-familiar path of Marxist-Leninist regimes. The government has spent vast sums of money on its military at the tragic expense of its desperately poor and starving people. The effects of a natural disaster have been compounded by the regime's obsession with power and ideology. Starving people are denied food in some regions for political reasons -- so reminiscent of Stalin's policies in the Ukraine in 1932 and 1933 which caused the death of some seven million people. And the Communist government in Ethiopia has cynically exploited national tragedy to force hundreds of thousands to move away from their homes -- again reminiscent of Stalin's policies in the '30s and '40s and of current Soviet policy in Afghanistan. Not surprisingly, an armed resistance to the Mengistu government has been underway for some years. One of its goals is to undo the consequences of Soviet-backed "national liberation."

In Angola, a minority Marxist-Leninist regime was put into power in 1975, and maintained since then, by 30,000 Cuban troops and thousands of Soviet and East European "advisers." The continued presence of this Soviet/Cuban military force is today a major impediment to Namibia's independence and to regional peace and security.

- 9 -

Here, again, a legitimate popular liberation movement has continued to challenge the regime's monopoly of power, and in recent years that movement has expanded the territory under its control. At some point in the future, there will have to be an internal political settlement in Angola that reflects Angolan reality, not external intervention.

Finally, an important struggle is being waged today closer to home in Central America. Its countries are in transition, trying to resolve the inequities and tensions of the past by developing workable reforms and democratic institutions. Violent anti-democratic minorities tied ideologically and militarily to the Soviet Union and Cuba are trying to prevent democratic reform and to seize power by force of arms. The outcome of this struggle will significantly affect not only the future of peace and democracy in our Hemisphere, but our own vital strategic interests.

In Nicaragua, in 1979, the Sandinista leaders pledged to the Organization of American States and to their own people to bring democratic freedom back to their country after decades of tyranny under Somoza. The Sandinistas have betrayed these pledges and the hopes of the Nicaraguan people; instead they have imposed a new and brutal tyranny that respects no frontiers.

- 10 -

Basing themselves on strong military ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union, they are rapidly turning their regime into a totalitarian state along a model that has become all too familiar. They are suppressing internal dissent, clamping down on the press, persecuting the Church, linking up with the terrorists of Iran, Libya, and the PLO, and seeking to undermine the legitimate and increasingly democratic governments of their neighbors.

This betrayal has forced many Nicaraguans who supported the original revolution against Somoza back into opposition. And while many resist peacefully, thousands now see no choice but to take up arms again, to risk everything so that their hopes for freedom and democratic government will not once again be denied.

Sandinista propaganda denounces their growing opposition as mercenaries and former National Guardsmen who remain loyal to the memory of Somoza. Some in this country seem all too willing to take these charges at face value, even though they come from the same Sandinista leaders who promised so much and delivered so little. But all you have to do is count the numbers: More people are fighting the Sandinistas than ever belonged to Somoza's National Guard.

- 11 -

In fact, most of the leaders of the armed resistance fought in the revolution against Somoza; and some even served in the new government until it became clear that the Sandinistas were bent on Communism not freedom, terror not reform, and aggression not peace. The freedom fighters include peasants and farmers, shopkeepers and vendors, teachers and professionals. What unites them to each other and to the other thousands of Nicaraguans who resist without arms is disillusionment with Sandinista militarism, corruption, and fanaticism. The myth that if Somoza was bad, the Sandinistas have to be good was bitterly exposed long ago for most Nicaraguans.

Despite uncertain and sporadic support from the West, the resistance in Nicaragua is growing. The Sandinistas have strengthened their Soviet and Cuban military ties -- but their popularity has declined sharply. The struggle in Nicaragua for democracy and freedom, and against Soviet-backed dictatorship, is far from over, and right now may well be a pivotal moment that decides the future.

America's Duty

This new phenomenon we are witnessing around the world -- popular insurgencies against Communist domination -- is not an American creation.

- 12 -

In every region, the people have made their own decision to stand and fight rather than see their cultures and freedoms "quietly erased." They have made clear their readiness to fight with or without outside support, using every available means, and enduring severe hardships, alone if necessary.

But America also has a responsibility. It is a simple fact, demonstrated time and again throughout our history, that "when America is strong and has the will to provide strong world leadership, there is more hope for democratic progress throughout the world than when we are weak and uncertain. It is more than mere coincidence that the last five years have been a time both of renewed American strength and leadership and a resurgence of democracy and freedom. As the strongest democratic nation on earth, the actions we take or do not take have both a direct and indirect impact on those who share our ideals and hopes all around the world.

The lesson of the postwar world should be clear: America must be the leader of the free world; there is no one else to take our place. If we do not lead, we create a vacuum into which our adversaries can move. Our national security suffers, our global interests suffer, and, yes, the worldwide struggle for democracy suffers.

- 13 -

The Soviets are fond of talking about the "correlation of forces," and for a few years it may have seemed that the correlation of forces favored Communist minorities backed by Soviet military power. Today, however, the Soviet empire is weakening under the strain of its own internal problems and external entanglements. And the United States has shown the will and the strength to take the steps necessary to defend our interests, to resist the spread of Soviet influence, and to protect freedom. Our actions, including such direct measures as the rescue of Grenada, have again begun to offer inspiration and hope to others.

The importance of American power and leadership to the strength of democracy has not been the only lesson of the postwar world. In many ways, the reverse has also proven true: the spread of democracy serves American interests. This may seem self-evident, but it is not.

Americans have always empathized with the struggles of others for freedom because we believe that freedom is a universal right. But the nature and extent of our support has varied from one instance to another. There have been times when the failure of democracy in certain parts of the world did not significantly affect our national security or our national interests.

- 14 -

In the eighteenth or even nineteenth centuries, the failure of democracy to take root elsewhere was unfortunate and even troubling to us, but it did not necessarily pose a threat to our own democracy.

In the last quarter of the twentieth century, that is no longer true. In almost every instance in the postwar world the imposition of Communist tyrannies has led to an increase in Soviet global power and influence. Supporting insurgencies against non-Communist governments in important strategic areas has become a way for the Soviets to extend the reach of their power, and a low-cost way to weaken their adversaries, whether they be China or the democracies of the West and Japan. This is true in Southeast Asia, Southwest Asia, Africa, and Central America.

When the United States supports democratic forces against the forces of totalitarianism, therefore, we do so not only out of our historical sympathy for democracy and freedom, but also in many cases in the interests of national security.

In many parts of the world we have no choice but to act, on both moral and strategic grounds.

- 15 -

How To Respond?

The question is, how should we act? What should America do to further both its interests and the cause of freedom and democracy?

As President Reagan said in his second Inaugural Address: "America must remain freedom's staunchest friend, for freedom is our best ally and it is the world's only hope to conquer poverty and preserve peace. Every blow we inflict against poverty will be a blow against its dark allies of oppression and war. Every victory for human freedom will be a victory for world peace."

A prudent strategy for supporting democracy and protecting our interests must combine several different elements, each suited to a different set of circumstances.

First, as a matter of fundamental principle, the United States supports peaceful democratic forces throughout the world, including those in non-Communist, pro-Western countries. Democratic institutions are the best guarantor of stability and peace. It is in our interest, therefore, to seek peaceful progress toward democracy in friendly countries where there is hope for such progress, whether in South Africa or Chile, the Republic of Korea or the Philippines.

- 16 -

The process of transition we seek is often complex and delicate, and we need to bear in mind that positive change can only come about in a manner consistent with a country's history, culture, and political realities. We should heed the cautionary lessons of both Iran and Nicaragua, in which pressures against right-wing authoritarian regimes were not well thought out and led to even more repressive forms of dictatorship. Our influence with friendly governments is a precious resource; we use it for constructive ends. We stay in contact with all democratic political forces, in opposition as well as in government. The historic number of transitions from authoritarian regimes to democracy in the last decade, from Southern Europe to Latin America, demonstrates the effectiveness of this approach -- as well as the fundamental difference between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. There are no examples of a Communist system, once consolidated, evolving into a democracy.

In June of 1982, in a speech before the British Parliament, President Reagan endorsed a new effort by a bipartisan group -- including prominent representatives of business, labor, and both the Democratic and Republican parties -- to enlist the energies of the American private sector in encouraging the spread of freedom and democracy around the world.

- 17 -

Today, the National Endowment for Democracy, the concrete result of that initiative, is beginning to play a significant role in assisting democratic groups in countries as diverse as South Africa, Chile, and Poland. The Endowment represents a practical form of American assistance to people abroad who share our ideals.

Second, we have a moral obligation to support friendly and allied democratic governments against a variety of threats by providing economic and security assistance. The more we can help others protect themselves and establish stable, democratic governments, the less need will there be for more direct American involvement to keep the peace. When democratic friends are threatened by externally-supported insurgencies, when hostile neighbors try to intimidate them by acquiring offensive arms or sponsor terrorism in an effort to topple their governments, international security is jeopardized. We must prove ourselves a reliable ally, a trustworthy defender of democracy and freedom.

The history of the postwar world has been one of low-level conflicts, guerrilla insurgencies, and small wars. The full-scale wars between great powers that characterized the first half of this century are unlikely to be repeated, at least not so long as we maintain a strong and credible deterrent, both nuclear and conventional.

- 18 -

The world's hopes for peace and security will depend more than ever on how intelligently and effectively we handle the smaller but still dangerous challenges.

Americans have always responded with courage when threats to our interests called for an immediate, all-out national effort. But the harder task is to recognize and meet challenges before they erupt into actual crises, before they represent an immediate threat, and before they require an all-out effort. We have a wide assortment of responses that fall between the extremes of inaction and the use of our military power, but we must be willing to use them or we will inevitably present ourselves with the unfortunate choice between those two extremes. Economic and security assistance is one of those crucial means of avoiding and deterring bigger threats.

Third, we should support the forces of freedom in Communist totalitarian states. We must not succumb to simplifications that democracy has enemies only on the left -- or only on the right, such as the currently fashionable idea that pressures and sanctions are acceptable against right-wing dictators but not to be used against left-wing totalitarian regimes. We should support the aspirations for freedom of peoples in Communist states just as we want freedom for people anywhere else.

- 19 -

For example, without raising false hopes, we have a duty to make it clear -- especially on the 40th anniversary of the Yalta Conference -- that the United States will never accept the artificial division of Europe into free and not free.

Fourth, and finally, our moral principles compel us to support those struggling against the imposition of Communist tyranny wherever and whenever we can. From the founding of this nation, Americans have believed that a people have the inherent right to resist oppression -- and that we have both a legal right and a moral obligation to help them.

Most of what we do to promote freedom is, and should continue to be, entirely open. Equally, there are a few programs which should be discussed and managed through special procedures of the Executive Branch and the Congress. Our Founding Fathers were sophisticated men who understood the necessity for discreet actions; after numerous controversies in the 1970s we now have a set of agreed and proper procedures for overseeing such special programs. In a democracy, clearly, the people have a right to know about and to shape the overall framework and basic principles that guide any area of policy. In those instances where the details are better kept confidential, Congress and the President can -- and must -- work together to ensure that policies are consistent with the basic principles that all American share.

- 20 -

But supporting freedom against the forces of tyranny has been and always will be supported by the American people.

Some who disagree with this take refuge in the relativistic notion that "one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist." This is nonsense. There is an obvious difference between those fighting to impose tyranny and those fighting to resist it. In El Salvador, pro-Communist guerrillas backed by the Soviet bloc are waging war against a democratically elected government; in Nicaragua and elsewhere, groups seeking democracy are resisting the iron grip of a totalitarian regime seeking to suppress democracy. Democracy offers mechanisms for peaceful change, legitimate political competition, and redress of grievances; violence directed against democracy lacks fundamental legitimacy. But resort to arms in behalf of freedom against repressive regimes or movements is legitimate, if there is no other way that freedom can be achieved.

In the 1970s, a European leader proposed to Brezhnev that peaceful coexistence should extend to the ideological sphere. Brezhnev responded firmly that this was impossible, that the ideological struggle continued even in an era of detente, and that the Soviet Union would forever support "national liberation" movements.

- 21 -

The practical meaning of that is clear. When Soviet Politburo member Gorbachev was in London recently, he affirmed that Nicaragua had gained its independence only with the Sandinista takeover. The Soviet Union and its proxies like Cuba pursue a policy based on the theory that any country not already Marxist-Leninist is not truly independent, and therefore the supply of money, arms, and training to overthrow its government is legitimate.

Again: "What's mine is mine. What's yours is up for grabs." This is the Brezhnev Doctrine.

The forces of Communist dictatorship feel free to aid and abet insurgencies in the name of "proletarian internationalism." It would be absurd if the democracies, at the same time, were inhibited from defending their own interests and the cause of democracy itself.

How can we as a country say to a young Afghan, Nicaraguan, or Cambodian: "Learn to live with oppression; only those of us who already have freedom deserve to pass it on to our children"? How can we say to those Salvadorans who stood so bravely in line to vote: "We will deny you the economic and military assistance for self-defense, but we are giving a free hand to the Sandinistas who seek to undermine your new democratic institutions"?

- 22 -

What we should do in each situation must of necessity vary. But it must always be clear whose side we are on -- the side of those who want to see a world based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a world based on respect for sovereignty and the rule of law. Wherever possible, the path to that world should be through political and economic means; but where dictatorships are based on the use of force to oppress their own people and to threaten their neighbors, the forces of freedom cannot place their trust in words alone.

Central America

Nowhere will the decisions we make be more critical than in Central America. Nowhere are both the strategic and moral stakes more clear. And perhaps nowhere do we face a greater test of our understanding of our responsibility in the modern world.

The Sandinista leaders in Nicaragua are moving quickly to consolidate their power by imposing a totalitarian regime. Should they achieve this primary goal, with Soviet-bloc and Cuban support, we could confront a second Cuba in this hemisphere, this time on the Central American mainland -- with all the strategic dangers that this implies.

- 23 -

If history is any guide, the Sandinistas will redouble their efforts to undermine neighboring governments in order to protect their "security," much as Vietnam sought to protect its "security" by invading Laos and Cambodia, and much as the Soviet Union saw to its "security" by subjugating Eastern Europe and invading Afghanistan. Needless to say, the first casualty of the consolidation of Sandinista power will be freedom and the hopes for democracy of the Nicaraguan people. The second casualty will be the security of Nicaragua's neighbors, and the security of the entire region.

I do not believe anyone in the United States wants to see this dangerous scenario unfold. Yet there are those who would look the other way, imagining that the problem will disappear by itself. There are those who would grant the Sandinistas a peculiar kind of immunity in our legislation -- in effect, enacting the Brezhnev Doctrine into American law.

But the logic of the current situation in Central America is inescapable:

-- The Sandinistas have global ties and plans for Nicaragua and the rest of Central America that are contrary to our strategic interests and to peace and freedom in the region.

- 24 -

-- The Sandinistas are dedicated Marxist-Leninists; it would be silly of us and insulting to them to imagine that they do not believe in their proclaimed goals. They will not modify or bargain away their position unless there is compelling incentive for them to do so.

-- The only incentive that has proved effective thus far has been vigorous opposition from the many Nicaraguans who seek freedom and democratic government.

-- Already, the pressures against Nicaragua have had the benefit of diverting Sandinista energies and resources away from promoting subversion in El Salvador, so that the Salvadoran government was able to disrupt Communist plans for a major offensive last year.

-- If that pressure is removed, the Sandinistas will have no reason to compromise and all our diplomatic efforts -- and those of the Contadora group -- will be undermined.

Our overall objective in Central America is to see the development of independent and democratic states able to manage their economic and social problems and live at peace with each other and with the rest of the hemisphere.

- 25 -

For this to become a reality there will have to be a fundamental change in Nicaraguan behavior in four areas:

-- First, Nicaragua must stop playing the role of surrogate for the Soviet Union and Cuba. As long as there are large numbers of Soviet and Cuban security and military personnel in Nicaragua, Central America will be embroiled in the East-West conflict.

-- Second, Nicaragua must reduce its armed forces to a level commensurate with its legitimate security needs -- a level comparable to those of its neighbors. The current imbalance is incompatible with regional stability.

-- Third, the Nicaraguans must absolutely and definitively stop their support for insurgents and terrorists in neighboring countries. All of Nicaragua's neighbors, and particularly El Salvador, have felt the brunt of Sandinista efforts to destabilize their governments. No country in Central America will be secure as long as this continues.

-- And fourth, the Sandinistas must live up to their commitments to democratic pluralism made to the OAS in 1979. The armed Nicaraguan resistance is now more than 10,000 strong.

- 26 -

Opposition groups, armed and unarmed, represent a genuine political force which is entitled to participate in the political processes of the country. It is up to the Government of Nicaragua to provide the political opening that will allow their participation.

We would welcome such a change in Nicaraguan behavior no matter how it was obtained. Whether it is achieved through the Contadora negotiations, through unilateral actions taken by the Sandinistas alone or in concert with their opponents, or through the collapse of the Sandinista regime is immaterial to us. And with that change of behavior we would see the basis for achieving a lasting peace in Central America.

The democratic forces in Nicaragua are on the frontline in the struggle for progress, security, and freedom in Central America. They are a diverse group. And our active help for them is the best insurance that their efforts will be directed consistently and effectively toward these objectives.

But the bottom line is this: Those who would cut off these freedom fighters from the rest of the democratic world are, in effect, consigning Nicaragua to the endless darkness of Communist tyranny. And they are leading the United States down a path of greater danger.

- 27 -

For if we do not take the appropriate steps now to pressure the Sandinistas to live up to their past promises -- to cease their arms buildup, to stop exporting Communist tyranny across their borders, to institute genuine freedom and democracy -- then later, when we can no longer avoid acting, the stakes will be higher and the costs greater.

Whatever options we may choose, we must be true to our principles and our history. As President Reagan said recently, "It behooves all of us who believe in democratic government, in free elections, in the respect for human rights to stand side by side with those who share our ideals, especially in Central America. We must not permit those heavily armed by a far away dictatorship to undermine their neighbors and to stamp out democratic alternatives at home. We must have the same solidarity with those who struggle for democracy, as our adversaries do with those who would impose Communist dictatorship."

We must, in short, stand firmly in the defense of our interests and principles, and the rights of peoples to determine their own form of government. The forces of democracy around the world merit our standing with them. To betray them would be a shameful abdication of our highest ideals.

Page Denied



Washington, D.C. 20520

Executive Registry

85- 670

February 14, 1985

UNCLASSIFIED

TO: NSC - Mr. Robert Kimmitt
CIA - Mr. Thomas B. Cormack
DEFENSE - COL R. J. Affourtit

SUBJECT: Draft Speech on America's Support for Freedom

Attached for your comments is a draft speech on the spread of democracy and America's traditional support for the forces of freedom, which Secretary Shultz will deliver in San Francisco on February 22.

Nicholas Platt
for Nicholas Platt
Executive Secretary

Attachment:

As stated.



L290

A revolution is sweeping the world today -- a democratic revolution.

This should not be a surprise. Yet it is noteworthy because many people in the West lost faith, for a time, in the idea of democracy. It was fashionable in some quarters to argue that democracy was culture-bound; that it was a luxury only industrial societies could afford; that other institutional structures were needed to meet the challenges of development; that to try to encourage others to adopt our system was ethnocentric and arrogant.

In fact, what began in the United States of America over two centuries ago as a bold new experiment in representative government has today captured the imagination and the passions of peoples on every continent. The Solidarity movement in Poland; resistance forces in Afghanistan, in Cambodia, in Nicaragua, in Ethiopia and Angola; dissidents in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; the peaceful forces for democracy in South Africa, Chile, the Republic of Korea, and the Philippines -- all these brave peoples have something in common: They are fighting for independence and freedom -- ideals which are at the core of democracy and which the United States has always championed.

- 2 -

The American Tradition

All Americans can be proud that the example of our Founding Fathers has helped inspire the struggles of millions around the globe. Throughout our own history, we have always believed that freedom is the birthright of all men and women, and that we could not be true to ourselves or to our principles unless we stood for freedom and democracy not only for ourselves, but for others.

And so, time and again in the last 200 years, we have lent our support -- moral and otherwise -- to those around the world struggling for freedom and independence. In the nineteenth century Americans smuggled guns and powder to Simon Bolivar, the Great Liberator; we supported the Polish patriots, and others seeking freedom. We well remembered how other nations, like France, had come to our aid during our own revolution.

In the twentieth century, as our power as a nation increased, we took on a greater role in protecting and promoting freedom and democracy around the world. Our commitment to these ideals has been strong and bipartisan in both word and deed.

- 3 -

During World War I, the Polish pianist Paderewski and the Czech statesman Masaryk raised funds in the United States; then Woodrow Wilson led the way at war's end in achieving the liberation of Poland, the creation of Czechoslovakia, and the independence of other states. In World War II, Franklin Roosevelt set forth a vision of democracy for the postwar world in the Atlantic Charter and Four Freedoms. The United States actively supported the process of decolonization. Harry Truman worked hard and successfully at protecting democratic institutions in postwar Western Europe and at helping democracy take root in West Germany and Japan. At the United Nations in 1948 we supported the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- which specifically calls upon all nations to have multiple political parties, regular and genuine elections, free trade unions, and a free press. John F. Kennedy drew upon the very foundations of America with his call to "pay any price ... to assure the survival and success of liberty."

The March of Democracy

The struggle for liberty is not always successful. But those who once despaired, who saw democracy on the decline, and who argued that we must lower our expectations, were premature. Civilizations decline when they stop believing in themselves; ours has thrived because we have never lost our faith and conviction that our values are worth defending.

- 4 -

Here at home we see a constant renewal of our faith in freedom, and we are seeing this faith spread throughout the world.

When Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy, was assassinated, we were shocked and saddened. But our confidence in the resiliency of democracy was renewed as hundreds of millions of India's people went to the polls freely to elect her successor. As Rajiv Gandhi leads his nation to new greatness, he demonstrates more clearly than any words or abstract scientific models that democracy is neither outmoded nor is it the exclusive possession of a few, rich, Western nations. It has worked for decades in countries as diverse as Costa Rica and Japan.

In the Western Hemisphere, almost 95 percent of the population of Latin America and the Caribbean today live under governments that are either democratic or clearly on the road to democracy -- in contrast to only one-third in 1979. In the last five years, popularly elected leaders have replaced military rulers or dictators in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Peru, and Grenada. Brazil and Uruguay will inaugurate new civilian presidents in March. After a long hemispheric twilight of dictatorship, this trend toward free elections and representative government is something to be applauded and supported.

- 5 -

These changes are driven by the determination of Latin Americans to establish and protect governments responsive to their own peoples. They are not just another swing of a pendulum. The depth of participation in increasingly open political systems reflects a long-term trend -- including the revolutions in communications and expectations, and a desire to repudiate violence and create a bulwark against dictatorships of both the left and the right.

The Challenge to the Brezhnev Doctrine

Democracy is an old idea, but today we are witnessing a new phenomenon. For many years we saw our adversaries freely backing insurgencies around the world to try to spread Communist dictatorships. The Soviet Union and its proxies, like Cuba and Vietnam, have consistently supplied money, arms, and training to overthrow non-Communist governments. In the guise of support for the so-called "struggle of peoples for national liberation," any non-Communist country was fair game for subversion. At the same time, any victory of Communism was held to be irreversible. This was the infamous Brezhnev Doctrine, first proclaimed at the time of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968: Once you're in the so-called "Socialist Camp," you're not allowed to leave. Thus the Soviets say to the rest of the world: "What's mine is mine. What's yours is up for grabs."

- 6 -

In recent years, however, a new development has created an obstacle to Soviet plans, and it is intimately connected to the resurgence of the democratic revolution. People are insisting on their right to independence or their right to choose their government free of outside control. Where once the Soviets may have thought that all discontent was ripe for turning into Communist insurgencies, today we see a new and different kind of struggle: freedom fighters around the world risking their lives against Communist tyrannies. We see brave men and women fighting to undo the Brezhnev Doctrine.

In December 1979, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan to preserve a Communist regime that had come to power in a coup a year and a half earlier. But their invasion met stiff resistance by Afghan resistance fighters, and the puppet government they installed has proved incapable of commanding popular support. Today, the Soviets have expanded their invading force and are now trying to devastate the population and the nation they cannot subdue. They are demolishing entire Afghan villages and have driven one out of every four Afghans to flee the country altogether. They have threatened neighboring countries like Pakistan and have been unwilling to negotiate seriously for a political solution under United Nations auspices.

- 7 -

In the face of this Soviet invasion, the Afghans who are fighting and dying for the liberation of their country have made a remarkable stand. The extraordinary courage of these brave men and women against superior forces has given them a growing capacity to resist. The countryside is largely in the hands of the resistance, and not even in the major cities can the Soviets claim complete control. The will of the Afghan resistance has not flagged. Clearly they do not share the belief of some in the West that it is better to see one's country "quietly erased," to use the memorable phrase of the Czech writer, Milan Kundera. They have held on to their cherished hopes for national liberation in an admittedly one-sided battle.

In Cambodia, the forces open to democracy, once all but annihilated by the Khmer Rouge, now face invasion and occupation by a Soviet ally, Communist Vietnam. Although Vietnam is too poor to feed, house, or care for the health of its own population, the Stalinist dictatorship of Hanoi is bent on imperial domination of Indochina, much as many had predicted before, during, and after the Vietnam War. But, as in Afghanistan, non-Communist resistance forces are struggling for Cambodian independence, and the ultimate outcome of that struggle is far from decided.

- 8 -

In Africa, as well, the Brezhnev Doctrine is being challenged by the drive for independence and freedom. In Ethiopia, the Soviet-backed dictatorship of President Mengistu has followed the now-familiar path of Marxist-Leninist regimes. The government has spent vast sums of money on its military at the tragic expense of its desperately poor and starving people. The effects of a natural disaster have been compounded by the regime's obsession with power and ideology. Starving people are denied food in some regions for political reasons -- so reminiscent of Stalin's policies in the Ukraine in 1932 and 1933 which caused the death of some seven million people. And the Communist government in Ethiopia has cynically exploited national tragedy to force hundreds of thousands to move away from their homes -- again reminiscent of Stalin's policies in the '30s and '40s and of current Soviet policy in Afghanistan. Not surprisingly, an armed resistance to the Mengistu government has been underway for some years. Their goal? To undo the consequences of Soviet-backed "national liberation."

In Angola, a minority Marxist-Leninist regime was put into power in 1975, and maintained since then, by 30,000 Cuban troops and thousands of Soviet and East European "advisers." The continued presence of this Soviet/Cuban intervention force is today a major impediment to Namibia's independence and to regional peace and security.

- 9 -

Here, again, a legitimate popular liberation movement has continued to challenge the regime's monopoly of power, and in recent years that movement has expanded the territory under its control. At some point in the future, there will have to be an internal political settlement in Angola that reflects Angolan reality, not external intervention.

Finally, an important struggle is being waged today closer to home in Central America. The Soviet Union and Cuba are backing armed zealots against the forces of democracy and freedom. And the outcome of that struggle will significantly affect not only the future of peace and democracy in our Hemisphere, but our own vital strategic interests.

In Nicaragua, in 1979, the Sandinista leaders pledged to the Organization of American States and to their own people to bring democratic freedom back to their country after decades of tyranny under Somoza. The Sandinistas have betrayed these pledges and the hopes of the Nicaraguan people; instead they have imposed a new and brutal tyranny that respects no frontiers. They have forged strong military ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union and are rapidly turning their regime into a totalitarian state along a model that has become all too familiar.

- 10 -

They are brutally suppressing internal dissent, clamping down on the press, persecuting the Church, linking up with the terrorists of Iran, Libya, and the PLO, and seeking to undermine the legitimate, and increasingly, democratic governments of their neighbors.

This betrayal has forced many Nicaraguans who supported the original revolution against Somoza back into opposition. And while many resist peacefully, thousands now see no choice but to take up arms again, to risk everything so that their cherished hopes for freedom and democratic government will not once again be snuffed out.

Who dares oppose the totalitarians? Sandinista propaganda denounces them as mercenaries and former National Guardsmen who remain loyal to the memory of Somoza. Some in this country seem all too willing to take these charges at face value, even though they come from the same Sandinista leaders who promised so much and delivered so little. But all you have to do is count the numbers: There are more resistance fighters today than there ever were members of Somoza's National Guard. Many of their leaders fought in the revolution against Somoza, and some even served in the new government until it became clear that the Sandinistas were bent on Communism not freedom, terror not reform, and aggression not peace.

- 11 -

The freedom fighters include peasants and farmers, shopkeepers and vendors, teachers and professionals. What unites them to each other and to the other thousands of Nicaraguans who resist without arms is disillusionment with Sandinista militarism, corruption, and fanaticism. The myth that if Somoza was bad, the Sandinistas have to be good was bitterly exposed long ago for most Nicaraguans.

Despite uncertain and sporadic support from the West, the resistance in Nicaragua is growing. The Sandinistas have seen their popularity decline sharply. Yet their ability to help spread Soviet and Cuban power in our hemisphere remains. The struggle for democracy and freedom in Nicaragua is far from over, and right now may well be a pivotal moment that decides the future.

America's Duty

This new phenomenon we are witnessing around the world -- popular insurgencies against Communist tyranny -- is not an American creation. In every region, the people have made their own decision to stand and fight rather than see their cultures and freedoms "quietly erased." They have made clear their readiness to fight with or without outside support, using every available means, and enduring severe hardships, alone if necessary.

- 12 -

But America also has a responsibility. It is a simple fact, demonstrated time and again throughout our history, that when America is strong and has the will to provide strong world leadership, there is more hope for democratic progress throughout the world than when we are weak and uncertain. It is more than mere coincidence that the last five years have been a time both of renewed American strength and leadership and a resurgence of democracy and freedom. As the strongest democratic nation on earth, the actions we take or do not take have both a direct and indirect impact on those who share our ideals and hopes all around the world.

The lesson of the postwar world should be clear: America must be the leader of the free world; there is no one else to take our place. If we do not lead, we create a vacuum into which our adversaries can move. Our national security suffers, our global interests suffer, and, yes, the worldwide struggle for democracy suffers.

The Soviets are fond of talking about the "correlation of forces," and for a few years it may have seemed that the correlation of forces favored Communist tyranny backed by growing Soviet power. Today, however, the Soviet empire is weakening under the strain of its own internal problems and external entanglements.

- 13 -

And the United States has shown the will and the strength to take the steps necessary to defend our interests, to resist the spread of Soviet influence, and to protect freedom. Our actions, including such direct measures as the rescue of Grenada, have again begun to offer inspiration and hope to others.

The importance of American power and leadership to the spread of democracy has not been the only lesson of the postwar world. In many ways, the reverse has also proven true: the spread of democracy serves American interests. This may seem self-evident, but it is not.

Americans have always empathized with the struggles of others for freedom and democracy because we believe that freedom is a universal right. But the nature and extent of our support has varied from one instance to another. There have been times when the failure of democracy in certain parts of the world did not significantly affect our national security or our national interests. In the eighteenth or even nineteenth centuries, the failure of democracy to take root elsewhere was unfortunate and even troubling to us, but it did not necessarily pose a threat to our own democracy.

- 14 -

In the last quarter of the twentieth century, that is no longer true. In almost every instance in the postwar world the imposition of Communist tyrannies has led to an increase in Soviet global power and influence. Supporting insurgencies against non-Communist governments in important strategic areas has become a way for the Soviets to extend the reach of their power, a low-cost way to pursue their goals of strengthening their own position and weakening their adversaries, whether they be China or the democracies of the West and Japan. This is true in Southeast Asia, Southwest Asia, Africa, and Central America.

When the United States supports democratic forces against the forces of totalitarianism, therefore, we do so not only out of our historical sympathy for democracy and freedom, but also in many cases in the interests of national security.

In many parts of the world we have no choice but to act, on both moral and strategic grounds.

How To Respond?

The question is, how should we act? What should America do to further both its interests and the cause of freedom and democracy?

- 15 -

As President Reagan said in his second Inaugural Address:
"America must remain freedom's staunchest friend, for freedom is our best ally and it is the world's only hope to conquer poverty and preserve peace. Every blow we inflict against poverty will be a blow against its dark allies of oppression and war. Every victory for human freedom will be a victory for world peace."

A prudent strategy for supporting democracy and protecting our interests must combine several different elements, each suited to a different set of circumstances.

First, we should support peaceful democratic forces in non-Communist, pro-Western countries. Democratic institutions are the best guarantor of stability and peace. It is in our interest, therefore, and consistent with our most fundamental principles, to seek peaceful progress toward democracy in friendly countries where there is hope for such progress, whether in South Africa or Chile, the Republic of Korea or the Philippines.

The process of transition we seek is often complex and delicate, and we need to bear in mind that positive change can only come about in a manner consistent with a country's history, culture, and political realities.

- 16 -

We should heed the cautionary lessons of both Iran and Nicaragua, in which pressures against right-wing authoritarian regimes were not well thought out and led to even more repressive forms of dictatorship. Our influence with friendly governments is a precious resource, and we use it for constructive ends. We stay in contact with moderate opposition forces. The historic number of transitions from authoritarian regimes to democracy in the last decade, from Southern Europe to Latin America, demonstrates the effectiveness of this approach -- as well as the fundamental differences between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. There are no examples of a Communist system, once consolidated, evolving into a democracy.

In June of 1982, in a speech before the British Parliament, President Reagan endorsed a new effort by a bipartisan group -- including prominent representatives of business, labor, and both the Democratic and Republican parties -- to enlist the energies of the American private sector in encouraging the spread of freedom and democracy around the world. Today, the National Endowment for Democracy, the concrete result of that initiative, is beginning to play a significant role in assisting democratic groups in countries as diverse as South Africa and Chile. The Endowment represents a practical form of American assistance to people abroad who share our ideals.

- 17 -

Second, we have a moral obligation to support friendly and allied democratic governments against a variety of threats by providing economic and security assistance. The more we can help others protect themselves and establish stable, democratic governments, the less need will there be for more direct American involvement to keep the peace. When democratic friends are threatened by externally-supported insurgencies, when hostile neighbors try to intimidate them by acquiring offensive arms or sponsor terrorism in an effort to topple their governments, international security is jeopardized. We must prove ourselves a reliable ally, a trustworthy defender of democracy and freedom.

The history of the postwar world has been one of low-level conflicts, guerrilla insurgencies, and small wars. The full-scale wars between great powers that characterized the first half of this century are unlikely to be repeated, at least not so long as we maintain a strong and credible deterrent, both nuclear and conventional. The world's hopes for peace and security will depend more than ever on how intelligently and effectively we handle the smaller but still dangerous challenges.

Americans have always responded with courage when threats to our interests called for an immediate, all-out national effort.

- 18 -

But the harder task is to recognize and meet challenges before they erupt into actual crises, before they represent an immediate threat, and before they require an all-out effort. We have a wide assortment of responses that fall between the extremes of inaction and the use of our military power, but we must be willing to use them or we will inevitably present ourselves with the unfortunate choice between those two extremes. Economic and security assistance is one of those crucial means of avoiding and deterring bigger threats.

Third, we should support the forces of freedom in Communist totalitarian states. We must not succumb to simplifications that democracy has enemies only on the left -- or only on the right, such as the currently fashionable idea that pressures and sanctions are acceptable against right-wing dictators but not to be used against left-wing totalitarian regimes. We should support the aspirations for freedom of peoples in Communist states just as we want freedom for people anywhere else. For example, without raising false hopes, we have a duty to make it clear -- especially on the 40th anniversary of the Yalta Conference -- that the United States will never accept the artificial division of Europe into free and not free.

Fourth, and finally, our moral principles compel us to support those struggling against the imposition of Communist tyranny wherever and whenever we can.

- 19 -

From the founding of this nation, Americans have believed that a people have the inherent right to resist the yoke of oppression -- and that we have both a legal right and a moral obligation to help them.

Most of what we do to promote freedom is, and should continue to be, entirely open. Equally, there are a few programs which should be discussed and managed through special procedures of the Executive Branch and the Congress. Our Founding Fathers were sophisticated men who understood the necessity for discreet actions; after numerous controversies in the 1970s we now have a set of agreed and proper procedures for overseeing such special programs. In a democracy, clearly, the people have a right to know about and to shape the overall framework and basic principles that guide any area of policy. In those instances where the details are better kept confidential, Congress and the President can -- and must -- work together to ensure that policies are consistent with the basic principles that all American share. But supporting freedom against the forces of tyranny has been and always will be supported by the American people.

Some who disagree with this take refuge in the relativistic notion that "one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist." This is nonsense.

- 20 -

There is an obvious difference between those fighting to impose tyranny and those fighting to resist it. In El Salvador, Communist guerrillas are waging war against a democratically elected government; in Nicaragua and elsewhere, groups seeking democracy are resisting the iron grip of a totalitarian regime seeking to suppress democracy. Democracy offers mechanisms for peaceful change, legitimate political competition, and redress of grievances; violence directed against it lacks fundamental legitimacy. But resort to arms in behalf of freedom against repressive regimes or movements is legitimate, if there is no other way that freedom can be achieved.

In the 1970s, a French President proposed to Brezhnev that peaceful coexistence should extend to the ideological sphere. Brezhnev responded firmly that this was impossible, that the ideological struggle continued even in an era of detente, and that the Soviet Union would forever support "national liberation" movements. The practical meaning of that is clear. When Soviet Politburo member Gorbachev was in London recently, he affirmed that Nicaragua had gained its independence only with the Sandinista takeover. The Soviet Union and its proxies like Cuba pursue a policy based on the theory that any country not already Marxist-Leninist is not truly independent, and therefore the supply of money, arms, and training to overthrow its government is legitimate.

- 21 -

Again: "What's mine is mine. What's yours is up for grabs." This is the Brezhnev Doctrine.

The forces of Communist dictatorship feel free to aid and abet insurgencies in the name of "proletarian internationalism." It would be absurd if the democracies, at the same time, were inhibited from defending their own interests and the cause of democracy itself.

How can we as a country say to a young Afghan, Nicaraguan, or Cambodian: "Learn to live with oppression; only those of us who already have freedom deserve to pass it on to our children"? How can we say to those Salvadorans who stood so bravely in line to vote: "We will deny you the economic and military assistance for self-defense, but we are giving a free hand to the Sandinistas who seek to undermine your new democratic institutions"?

What we should do in each situation must of necessity vary. But it must always be clear whose side we are on -- the side of those who want to see a world based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a world based on respect for sovereignty and the rule of law. Wherever possible, the path to that world should be through political and economic means; but where dictatorships are based on the use of force to oppress their own people and to threaten their neighbors, the forces of freedom cannot place their trust in words alone.

- 22 -

Central America

Nowhere will the decisions we make be more critical than in Central America. Nowhere are the strategic and moral stakes more clear. And perhaps nowhere do we face a greater test of our understanding of our responsibility in the modern world.

The Sandinista leaders in Nicaragua are moving quickly to consolidate their power by imposing a totalitarian regime. Should they achieve this primary goal, with Soviet-bloc and Cuban support, we could confront a second Cuba in this hemisphere, this time on the Central American mainland -- with all the strategic dangers that this implies. If history is any guide, the Sandinistas will redouble their efforts to undermine neighboring governments in order to protect their "security," much as Vietnam sought to protect its "security" by invading Laos and Cambodia, and much as the Soviet Union saw to its "security" by subjugating Eastern Europe and invading Afghanistan. Needless to say, the first casualty of the consolidation of Sandinista power will be freedom and the hopes for democracy of the Nicaraguan people. The second casualty will be the security of Nicaragua's neighbors, and the security of the entire region.

- 23 -

I do not believe anyone in the United States wants to see this dangerous scenario unfold. Yet there are those who would look the other way, imagining that the problem will disappear by itself. There are those who would grant the Sandinistas a peculiar kind of immunity in our legislation -- in effect, enacting the Brezhnev Doctrine into American law.

But the logic of the current situation in Central America is inescapable:

-- The Sandinistas have global ties and plans for Nicaragua and the rest of Central America that are contrary to our strategic interests and to peace and freedom in the region.

-- The Sandinistas are dedicated Marxist-Leninists; it would be silly of us and insulting to them to imagine that they do not believe in their proclaimed goals. They will not modify or bargain away their position unless there is compelling incentive for them to do so.

-- The only incentive that has proved effective thus far has been vigorous opposition from the many Nicaraguans who seek freedom and democratic government.

- 24 -

-- Already, the pressures against Nicaragua have had the benefit of diverting Sandinista energies and resources away from promoting subversion in El Salvador, so that the Salvadoran government was able to disrupt Communist plans for a major offensive last year.

-- If that pressure is removed, the Sandinistas will have no reason to compromise and all our diplomatic efforts -- and those of the Contadora group -- will be undermined.

Our goals in Central America are, as always, to help create the conditions for progress, security, and freedom. These are goals we share with all the countries of the region and throughout Latin America.

The democratic forces in Nicaragua are on the frontline in this struggle. They are a diverse group. And our active help for them is the best insurance that their efforts will be directed consistently and effectively toward these objectives.

But the bottom line is this: Those who would cut off these freedom fighters from the rest of the democratic world are, in effect, consigning Nicaragua to the endless darkness of Communist tyranny. And they are leading the United States down a path of greater danger.

- 25 -

For if we do not take the appropriate steps now to pressure the Sandinistas to live up to their past promises -- to institute genuine freedom and democracy, to cease their Soviet- and Cuban-supplied arms buildup, to stop exporting Communist tyranny across their borders -- then later, when we are forced to act, the stakes will be higher and the costs greater.

Whatever options we may choose, we must be true to our principles and our history. As President Reagan said recently, "It behooves all of us who believe in democratic government, in free elections, in the respect for human rights to stand side by side with those who share our ideals, especially in Central America. We must not permit those heavily armed by a far away dictatorship to undermine their neighbors and to stamp out democratic alternatives at home. We must have the same solidarity with those who struggle for democracy, as our adversaries do with those who would impose Communist dictatorship."

The forces of democracy around the world merit our standing with them. To betray them would be a shameful abdication of our highest ideals.